UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/529,587	04/14/2000	JOHN A. DANE	EPRNT-101XX	2045	
Patent Legal Sta	7590 04/20/201 aff	EXAMINER			
Eastman Kodak	Company	TODD, GREGORY G			
343 State Street Rochester,, NY 14650-2201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,,			2457		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/20/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/529,587	DANE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
I .	I		

	GREGORY G. TODD	2457	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water MANENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	icalice
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		Cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	octed claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		oted cidims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			, .
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	owable if submitted in a separate, t	-	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proven the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>3,4,7,8,10,14-17,19,20,23,24,27,28 and</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	<u>/ 30-36</u> .		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu  See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ( 13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/ARIO ETIENNE/	/G C T /		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457	/G. G. T./ Examiner, Art Unit 2457		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment raises new issues requiring further search and consideration. Such new issues being at least that the different classes of users are identified by the event profile and for a particular event; the classes of users composition including event hosts and guests having optional viewing and editing privileges; level of access being elected by the photographer; editing being done by at least photographer and hosts; guests exlcuded from editing; etc. Amendment further introduces potential 112 issues, such as the "event hosts and guests...have optional viewing and editing privileges". First, 'optional' renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. Second, the guests are stated as having optional editing privileges, while later in the claim the guests are excluded from "said editing functions" / privileges. Third, the consistency as to whether the editing functions are the same as the introduced editing privileges.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant arguments are substantially directed toward the claims as amended. However, the proposed amendments are not herein entered, and those arguments are moot. Further, Examiner maintains Garfinkle's teachings as being obvious to teach such different levels of access and that the photographer taking the pictures and editing and displaying such images would have different access to the images than a customer ordering such images, as described fully in the Rejection in view of PhotoNet.